



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,817	10/25/2001	Edward Scheidt	STSPT34	1778
7590	02/28/2005		EXAMINER	
Thomas M. Champagne IP Strategies, P.C. 12 1/2 WALL STREET SUITE J ASHEVILLE, NC 28801			ANANTHANARAYANAN, RAMYA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	
DATE MAILED: 02/28/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/035,817	SCHEIDT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ramya Ananthanarayanan	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2001.

2a)  This action is FINAL.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

1. Claims 1-38 have been examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites the limitation "said user private key" in lines 11 and 15 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Examiner will treat the limitation as referring to the signing private key previously disclosed in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-10, 12, 16-33, 35, 36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Kapp et al. (U.S. Patent 5,195,133) in view of Scheidt et al. (U.S. Patent 6,490,680).

6. The applied reference has common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention “by another”; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

7. Kapp et al. and Scheidt et al. are analogous art because both are in the field of electronic communication.

8. With respect to claim 1, Kapp et al. disclose, for an electronic signature device comprising a processor (item 64), a memory (item 64), a user input device including a first signature input device (item 20), and a device interface (item 32), all communicatively connected by at least one

bus (It is inherent in a computer with a memory, processor, and other components, to have a bus that interconnects memory, processor, and other components of the computer.), a method of personalizing the electronic signature device to a user, comprising:

Receiving a digitized written user signature of the user via the first signature input device (column 2, lines 30-32);

Generating a prime parameter, a sub-prime parameter, and a base parameter (column 6, lines 20-26);

Generating a signing private key (column 6, lines 49-53: DES uses secret private keys.);

Generating a signing public key based on said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters (column 2, lines 40-43);

Generating a biometric electronic template based on said digitized written user signature (column 2, lines 31-35); and

Storing said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters, said user private and public keys, and said biometric electronic template in the memory (column 3, lines 41-43).

9. Kapp et al. do not disclose a method of personalizing the electronic signature device to a user, comprising:

Generating a user public key based on said user private key and said prime and base parameters.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method of personalizing the electronic signature device to a user, comprising:

Generating a prime parameter, a sub-prime parameter, and a base parameter (column 5, lines 66-67 to column 6, line 1; column 8, lines 27-31: It is inherent in Diffie-Hellman key exchange that two prime parameters and a base parameter are used and hence created.);

Generating a signing private key (column 5, lines 66-67 to column 6, line 1: It is inherent in asymmetric Diffie-Hellman key exchange that a private key is used and hence created.);

Generating a signing public key based on said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters (column 5, lines 66-67 to column 6, line 1: It is inherent in Diffie-Hellman key exchange that two prime parameters and a base parameter are used and hence created. The key used to sign documents is the same as the user's public key. In applicant's disclose, applicant defined user as the signer of the document.);

Generating a user public key based on said user private key and said prime and base parameters (column 5, lines 66-67 to column 6, line 1: It is inherent in Diffie-Hellman key exchange that two prime parameters and a base parameter are used and hence created.); and

Storing said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters, said user private and public keys, in the memory (column 9, lines 56-61).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. in order to meet the objectives of data confidentiality, access control and user authentication (column 5, lines 25-28).

11. With respect to claims 2 and 27, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters are based on Diffie-Hellman parameters. Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters are based on Diffie-Hellman parameters (column 5, lines 66-67 to column 6, line 1; column 8, lines 27-3).
12. The motivational benefits of combining the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Khan et al. are disclosed above.
13. With respect to claim 3, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters are generated based on a seed value. Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters are generated based on a seed value (column 13, lines 55-57).
14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. in order to use the user's biometric template to form the basis for the user's private key (column 13, lines 53-54).
15. With respect to claim 4, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein the seed value is one of a random value and a pseudorandom number. Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein the seed value is one of a random value and a pseudorandom number (column 13, lines 57-58).

16. The motivational benefits of combining the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Khan et al. are disclose above.

17. With respect to claim 5, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein the seed value is received from the user via the user interface.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein the seed value is received from the user via the user interface (column 13, lines 58-60).

18. The motivational benefits of combining the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Khan et al. are disclose above.

19. With respect to claim 6, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein the user interface further comprises a password input device, and said method further comprises:

receiving a user password via the password input device;

generating a password encryption key based on the user password;

encrypting a known value with the password encryption key to produce an encrypted output; and

storing the encrypted known value in the memory.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein the user interface further comprises a password input device (column 9, lines 66-67), and said method further comprises:

receiving a user password via the password input device (column 9, lines 61-63);

generating a password encryption key based on the user password (column 9, line 59);

encrypting a known value with the password encryption key to produce an encrypted output (column 9, lines 56-59); and  
storing the encrypted known value in the memory (column 9, lines 59-61).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. in order to provide a method to revoke a user's credentials (column 10, lines 12-13).

21. With respect to claims 7 and 29, Kapp et al. disclose a method wherein said known value is said biometrics electronic template (column 2, lines 34-35).

22. With respect to claims 8 and 30, Kapp et al. disclose a method wherein receiving said digitized user signature is repeated at least once (column 6, lines 65-68: By comparing the digitized signature with another signature, the process must have been performed at least twice.).

23. With respect to claims 9 and 31, Kapp et al. disclose a method wherein receiving said digitized user signature is repeated at least once (column 6, lines 65-68: By comparing the digitized signature with another signature, the process must have been performed at least twice.).

24. Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein generating said biometrics electronic template to produce the first verification result is repeated at least once.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein generating said biometrics electronic template to produce the first verification result is repeated at least once (column 12, lines 54-56).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. in order to provide a threshold to decide if matches to the biometric template are successful (column 12, lines 59-61).

26. With respect to claims 10, 33 and 36, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein said biometric electronic template is generated based on a mathematic transformation of said digitized written user signature.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein said biometric electronic template is generated based on a mathematic transformation of said digitized written user signature (column 12, lines 52-53).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. in order to enhance authentication of a user (column 11, lines 33-34).

28. With respect to claim 12, Kapp et al. does not disclose a method wherein the electronic signature device is communicatively connected to a certificate authority via the device interface, and said method further comprises:

Sending a certificate request to the certificate authority;

Receiving a certificate package from the certificate authority; and

Storing said certificate package in the memory.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein the electronic signature device is communicatively connected to a certificate authority via the device interface, and said method further comprises:

Sending a certificate request to the certificate authority (column 13, lines 28-30);

Receiving a certificate package from the certificate authority (column 13, lines 25-27, lines 31-33); and

Storing said certificate package in the memory (column 13, lines 28-29).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. in order to provide data origin authentication, integrity, and non-repudiation (column 13, lines 22-24).

30. With respect to claim 16, Kapp et al. does not disclose a method wherein said certificate package comprises a digital certificate.

Scheidt discloses a method wherein said certificate package comprises a digital certificate (column 13, lines 41-43).

31. With respect to claim 17, Kapp et al. does not disclose a method wherein said certificate package comprises a digital certificate and a root value.

Scheidt discloses a method wherein said certificate package comprises a digital certificate and a root value (column 13, lines 41-43, lines 55-63).

32. With respect to claim 18, Kapp et al. disclose a method wherein the device interface is a card interface (item 32; column 7, lines 39-44).

33. With respect to claim 19, Kapp et al. disclose a method wherein the electronic signature device further comprises a power source that is at least one of a battery and the computer interface (column 4, lines 43-48; The apparatus disclosed in the prior art is a computer which is providing power to the signature device. The apparatus has input/output devices, memory, and a processor, and hence constitutes a computer.).

34. With respect to claim 20, Kapp et al. disclose a method wherein the first signature input device is integral with the electronic signature device (Figure 5).

35. With respect to claims 21 and 23, Kapp et al. disclose a method wherein the first signature input device or said user interface is connected to the at least one bus through the device interface (It is inherent in a computer to have a bus connect peripherals (such as the first signature input device) with the computer and processor. In the prior art, the device is connected through the device interface to the processor (Figure 5, items 50, 46, and 64)).

36. With respect to claim 22, Kapp et al. disclose a method wherein at least a portion of said user interface is integral with the electronic signature device (Figure 5).

37. With respect to claim 24, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein said user public key is one of a random number and a pseudorandom number.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein said user public key is one of a random number and a pseudorandom number (column 7, lines 51-54).

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. in order to generate and manage the encryption algorithms and keys maintained by the system (column 7, lines 43-54).

39. With respect to claims 25 and 38, Kapp et al. disclose a method wherein said user public key is smaller than said sub-prime parameter (column 6, lines 40-44).

40. With respect to claim 26, Kapp et al. disclose, for an electronic signature device comprising a processor (item 64), a memory (item 64), having a biometric electronic template (column 3, lines 41-43), a prime parameter (column 6, lines 20-26), a sub-prime parameter (column 6, lines 20-26), and a base parameter (column 6, lines 20-26), user public data comprising a user public key (column 6, lines 60-61), and a user private key stored therein (column 3, lines 41-43), a user interface comprising a signature input device (item 20), a device interface adapted to interface a computer (item 32), and at least one bus operably connected to the processor, the memory, the user interface, and the device interface (It is inherent in a computer with a memory, processor, and other components, to have a bus that interconnects memory, processor, and other

components of the computer.), a method of originating an electronically signed transaction, said method comprising:

Verifying whether a user is permitted to originate the electronically signed transaction with the electronic signature device, comprising

Receiving a digitized written originator signature via the user interface column 2, lines 30-32), and

Comparing said digitized written originator signature against the biometric electronic template to produce a first verification result (column 5, lines 53-57);

Receiving a transaction package through one of the user interface and the device interface (column 2, lines 25-29);

Combining said transaction package through one of said digitized originator signature and a digitized user signature extracted from the biometric electronic template to produce an originator signature block (column 2, lines 30-34);

Encrypting said originator signature block with said shared encryption key to produce an encrypted signature block (column 6, lines 48-50);

Combining said encrypted signature block, said ephemeral private key, the prime parameter, and at least a portion of the user public data to produce an electronically signed transaction (column 6, lines 40-50; column 6, lines 30-36); and

If the user is verified, providing said electronically signed transaction via the device interface (column 5, lines 57-61).

41. Kapp et al. do not disclose a method of originating an electronically signed transaction, said method comprising:

Generating an ephemeral private key based on the prime, sub-prime, and base parameters;

Generating an ephemeral public key based on said ephemeral private key and the prime and base parameters;

Generating a shared encryption key based on said ephemeral public key, the user public key, and the prime parameter.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method of originating an electronically signed transaction, said method comprising:

Generating an ephemeral private key based on the prime, sub-prime, and base parameters (column 5, lines 66-67 to column 6, line 1; column 8, lines 27-31: It is inherent in Diffie-Hellman key exchange that two prime parameters and a base parameter are used and hence created.);

Generating an ephemeral public key based on said ephemeral private key and the prime and base parameters (column 5, lines 66-67 to column 6, line 1; column 8, lines 27-31: It is inherent in Diffie-Hellman key exchange that two prime parameters and a base parameter are used and hence created.);

Generating a shared encryption key based on said ephemeral public key, the user public key, and the prime parameter (column 5, lines 66-67 to column 6, line 1; column 8, lines 27-31: It is inherent in Diffie-Hellman key exchange that two prime parameters and a base parameter

are used and hence created. It is also inherent in Diffie-Hellman key exchange that the exchange results in a secret shared encryption key used to transmit messages and transactions.).

42. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Smithies et al. in order to meet the objectives of data confidentiality, access control and user authentication (column 5, lines 25-28).

43. With respect to claim 28, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein the user interface further comprises a password input device, the memory has further stored therein an encrypted known value, and verifying whether the user is permitted to originate the electronically signed transaction with the electronic signature device further comprises:

Receiving a user password via the password input device;

Generating a password encryption key based on the user password;

Decrypting the encrypted known value with said password encryption key to produce a second verification result.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein the user interface further comprises a password input device (column 9, lines 66-67), the memory has further stored therein an encrypted known value (column 9, lines 59-61), and verifying whether the user is permitted to originate the electronically signed transaction with the electronic signature device further comprises:

Receiving a user password via the password input device (column 9, lines 61-63);

Generating a password encryption key based on the user password (column 9, line 59);

Decrypting the encrypted known value with said password encryption key to produce a second verification result (column 9, lines 24-29).

44. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. in order to provide a method to revoke a user's credentials (column 10, lines 12-13).

45. With respect to claim 32, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein comparing said digitized written originator signature against the biometric electronic template comprises generating a temporary template based on said digitized written originator signature, and comparing said temporary template to the biometric electronic template.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein comparing said digitized written originator signature against the biometric electronic template comprises generating a temporary template based on said digitized written originator signature (column 13, lines 10-15), and comparing said temporary template to the biometric electronic template (column 13, lines 10-15).

46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. in order to not store the template (column 13, lines 7-8).

47. With respect to claim 35, Kapp et al. do not disclose a method wherein comparing said digitized written originator signature against the biometric electronic template comprises:

Generating a temporary signature based on the biometric electronic template, and

Comparing said temporary signature to said digitized written originator signature.

Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein comparing said digitized written originator signature against the biometric electronic template comprises:

Generating a temporary signature based on the biometric electronic template (column 13, lines 11-13), and

Comparing said temporary signature to said digitized written originator signature (column 13, lines 11-13).

48. The motivational benefits of combining the teachings of Scheidt et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. are disclosed above.

49. Claims 11, 34, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Kapp et al. (U.S. Patent 5,195,133) and Scheidt et al. (U.S. Patent 6,490,680) in view of Vardanyan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,079,621).

50. The applied reference has common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter

disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

51. Kapp et al., Scheidt et al., and Vardanyan et al. are analogous art because both are in the field of electronic communication.

52. With respect to claims 11, 34, and 37, Kapp et al. and Scheidt et al. do not disclose a method wherein the mathematical transformation is a Fourier transformation.

Vardanyan et al. disclose a method wherein the mathematical transformation is a Fourier transformation (column 3, 48-52).

53. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Vardanyan et al. with the teachings of Kapp et al. and Scheidt et al. in order to extract information from the digitized biometric information (column 3, lines 48-49).

54. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Kapp et al. (U.S. Patent 5,195,133) and Scheidt et al. (U.S. Patent 6,490,680) in view of Vaeth et al. (U.S. Patent 6,035,402).

55. The applied reference has common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention “by another”; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

56. Kapp et al., Scheidt et al., and Vaeth et al. are analogous art because both are in the field of electronic communication.

57. With respect to claim 13, neither Kapp et al. nor Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein said certificate request comprises said user public key.

Vaeth et al. discloses a method wherein said certificate request comprises said user public key (column 6, lines 10-12).

58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Vaeth et al. with the combined teachings of Kapp et al. and Scheidt et al. in order to qualify certification requests and issue certificates (column 5, lines 28-30).

59. With respect to claim 14, Kapp et al. disclose that they use the transaction code (verification data) consisting of the parameters in order to verify the date and time of the biometric sampling (column 6, lines 60-63).

60. Neither Kapp et al. nor Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein said certificate request further comprises at least one of said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters.

Vaeth et al. discloses a method wherein said certificate request further comprises at least one of said prime, sub-prime, and base parameters (column 6, lines 10-12: Vaeth et al. disclose providing verification data in the certification request.).

61. The motivational benefit of combining the teachings of Vaeth et al. with the combined teachings of Kapp et al. and Scheidt et al. has been disclosed above.
62. With respect to claim 15, Kapp et al. disclose that they use the transaction code consisting of the parameters in order to verify the date and time of the biometric sampling (column 6, lines 60-63).
63. Neither Kapp et al. nor Scheidt et al. disclose a method wherein said certificate request comprises said user public key and said prime parameter.  
Vaeth et al. discloses a method wherein said certificate request comprises said user public key and said prime parameter (column 5, lines 28-30; column 6, lines 10-12: Vaeth et al. disclose providing verification data in the certification request.).
64. The motivational benefit of combining the teachings of Vaeth et al. with the combined teachings of Kapp et al. and Scheidt et al. has been disclosed above.

***Conclusion***

65. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: U.S. Patent 5,647,017 to Smithies et al., U.S. Patent 6,401,206 to Khan et al..

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramya Ananthanarayanan whose telephone number is (571) 272-5860. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 -5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RA



ANDREW CALDWELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER